

restriction requirement.

In the first Office Action in this continued examination application, the Examiner continued to reject the claims under § 112, but has withdrawn all of the prior rejections on prior art, has cited new prior art, and has applied that new prior art in new grounds of rejection against all of the claims. In this Office Action, all of the elected claims are now rejected as follows:

1. All of the claims currently elected in the application, claims 1-6, 8, 10, 11, 15-18 and 20-25, continue to be rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite for containing the term "about";
2. Claims 1, 2, 4, 15, 16, 18, 21 and 23-25 were rejected as obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over NAYDOWSKI et al. (5,605,568) in view of SCHIAPPA et al (4,729,928);
3. Claim 5 was rejected as obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over NAYDOWSKI et al in view of SCHIAPPA et al, and further in view of GOVERS et al (6,482,581);
4. Claims 6, 8, 11, 20 and 22 were rejected as obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over NAYDOWSKI et al in view of SCHIAPPA et

al, and further in view of VIRATANEN (6,143,064);

5. Claims 1-3, 8, 10, 15-17, 21 and 23-25 were rejected as obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over HIORNS et al (6,284,034) in view of SCHIAPPA et al;
6. Claim 5 was rejected as obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over HIORNS et al in view of SCHIAPPA et al and GOVERS et al;
7. Claims 6, 8, 11, 20 and 22 were rejected as obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over HIORNS et al in view of SCHIAPPA et al and further in view of VIRATANEN;
8. Claims 1, 2, 4, 11, 15, 16, 18, 21 and 23-25 were rejected as obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over STRAUCH et al. (4,279,661) in view of SCHIAPPA et al;
9. Claim 5 was rejected as obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over STRAUCH et al in view of SCHIPPA et al, and further in view of GOVERS et al;
10. Claims 6, 8, 11, 20 and 22 were rejected as obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over STRAUCH et al in view of SCHIAPPA et al, and further in view of VIRATANEN; and